

REMARKS

In the Examiner's Communication he has indicated that applicants' election of the specie of Figs. 14-18 and the drive mechanism of Figs. 22-29 for examination represents an election of mutually exclusive embodiments. However, it is submitted that such is not the case. Either of two drive embodiments can be used to operate in either of the two manners, it being only a matter of changing the connections as stated in paragraph [0058] and paragraphs [0053] and [0054] make it clear the two drive embodiments differ only in the use of connecting rods and locking blocks in the embodiment of Figs. 30 & 31 while that of Figs. 22-29 does not. Thus, it is submitted that both drive mechanism embodiments are usable with all of the roof embodiments, irrespective of the specific connection arrangement cited by the Examiner, such being only one of manners of connection of the drive to the roof. An action on the merits of the elected claims in accordance with applicant's prior election is therefore in order and is now requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David S. Safran
Registration No. 27,997

NIXON PEABODY LLP
401 9th Street, N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128

Telephone No.: (703) 827-8094

DSS:kmm

Best Available Copy

NVA276932.1